



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,986	12/15/2005	Eliot Bloom	PA1766	3739
28390	7590	08/27/2010	EXAMINER	
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC. IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT 3576 UNOCAL PLACE SANTA ROSA, CA 95403				EREZO, DARWIN P
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3773				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.vascilegal@medtronic.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,986	BLOOM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Darwin P. Erezo	3773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2010.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the applicant's communication filed on 6/17/10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,348,064 to Kanner in view of US 5,342,396 to Cook.

Kanner discloses a device that is capable of contracting tissue, the device comprising a body 10 having a longitudinal axis (see ref. no. 100 in Fig. 1), and a plurality of legs 12A-12C, each leg having one end coupled to the body and being radially splayed about the axis (see Fig.1), each leg including a snap-acting spring tip 18A-18C (the legs can be made of elastic materials such as nitinol; col. 7, ll. 48-50); wherein each leg is capable of transformation between a deployment state (Fig. 1-2) and a treatment state (Fig. 3); wherein each spring tips are closer to the longitudinal axis when the legs are in the treatment state (Fig. 3); wherein each tips are pointed (spicules); wherein the device can be made of titanium, stainless steel or nitinol, which is radiopaque (col. 4, ll. 20-25); wherein the device is fully capable of shortening a radial dimension of a mitral valve annulus.

Kanner discloses all the limitations of the claims except for each legs having a bistable configuration and a deformation element. However, Cook discloses a staple that uses a notch 305 as a deformation element in order to allow the tips of the staple to bend inwardly. The staple tips of Cook has a bistable configuration (first stable configuration is shown in Fig. 3; second stable configuration is shown in Fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the legs of the device of Kanner to include deformation elements because it would allow the tips to bend inwardly, which would provide more tension against the tissue and better secure the staple to the tissue.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanner in view of Cook, and in further view of US 4,610,251 to Kumar.

Kanner, as provided in the rejections above, discloses all the limitations of the claim except for each legs having two tip members. However, providing two tip members in a staple is well known in the art, as shown in Figs. 1-6 of Kumar. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kanner to include two tip members as having two tip members would provide better securement of the staple to the tissue.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanner in view of Cook, and in further view of US 4,635,637 to Schreiber.

Kanner, as provided in the rejections above, discloses all the limitations of the claim except for each legs having a barb directed towards the body. However, Schreiber discloses a staple that has barbs 30,32. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add barbs to the legs of Kanner since it would prevent the staple from accidentally backing out of the tissue.

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanner in view of Cook, and in further view of US 7,112,214 to Peterson et al.

Kanner, as provided in the rejections above, discloses all the limitations of the claim except for the device including a therapeutic agent. However, providing a therapeutic agent on a staple fastener is well known in the art, as taught by Peterson in col. 11, ll. 8. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kanner to include therapeutic agent since it would also help treat the fastened tissue with medication.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Note that the examiner is using the Cook reference, which was previously cited, for disclosing that is well known to provide staple tips with both a bistable configuration and deformation notches.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Darwin P. Erezo whose telephone number is (571)272-4695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571) 272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Darwin P. Erezo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3773